



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,108	12/21/2000	Lalitha Agnihotri	US 000391	1487

7590 12/29/2004

PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICAN CORP  
580 WHITE PLAINS RD  
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER

USTARIS, JOSEPH G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2616

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/747,108

Applicant(s)

AGNIHOTRI ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph G Ustaris

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-9,11,12,14-17,19,20,22-25,27,28 and 30-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, 20, 22-25, 27, 28, and 30-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is in response to the amendment dated 12 July 2004 in application 09/747,108.

The objection to the abstract is now withdrawn in view of the amendments.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, 20, 22-25, 27, 28, and 30-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmad et al. (US006263507B1) in view of Liou et al. (US006580437B1).

Regarding claim 1, Ahmad et al. (Ahmad) discloses a control device and system controller or "multimedia summary generator" for use in electronic devices such as televisions, a computer display monitor, or "video display system" (See column 1 lines 10-20 and column 2 lines 60-67). The control device and system controller is able to summarize multiple television news programs or "video programs" within a graphical user interface (GUI) or "multimedia summary on a display page" (See Fig. 2A and 2B; column 4 lines 40-60). The control device and system controller displays the summary of the television news broadcasts within the GUI via television and/or a computer

display monitor (See Fig. 1, 2A, and 2B). The GUI displays news programs that have different news stories or "topics" and each video images represents a news story within the GUI (See Fig. 2A and 2B; column 23 lines 30-50). Furthermore, Ahmad discloses an information map region, within the GUI, where the user can easily move freely among different news stories of the news program or "entry point that corresponds to...topic". Each row allows the user to jump from one news story to another or "in response to a selection by a viewer" and would display the associated video images and text or "portion of said video program" related to that story (See Ahmad Fig. 2A and 2B; column 16 lines 3-55). However, Ahmad does not disclose a feature where the system can identify a subtopic and an entry point related to the subtopic.

Liou et al. (Liou) discloses a system for organizing videos based on closed-caption information. The system constructs a video table of contents. The system builds a tree defining the different stories or "topics" and the different speakers or "subtopics" associated with the stories of the program. The system breaks the video up according to the closed-caption data and the tree is made up of video shots and text that are associated with each story and speaker (See Fig. 5, 6, and 9; column 1 lines 20-30, column 2 lines 40-65, column 6 lines 35-55, column 7 lines 30-60). Furthermore, Liou discloses that the organized tree of the video table of contents allows users to jump directly to different speakers or "entry point that corresponds to one subtopic" and that the video corresponding to a speaker or story is displayed based on the selection of the user (See Fig. 8 and 9; column 7 lines 30-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the control

device and system controller disclosed by Ahmad to identify speakers or “subtopics” within a news story of a news program and provide an “entry point” related to the speakers, as taught by Liou, in order to provide a more informative, detailed, and easy access summary of the news program for the user.

Regarding claim 3, the information map region displays multiple news stories or “plurality of topics” (See Ahmad Fig. 2A and 2B) where the user can move freely from one news story to another as discussed in claim 1. In addition, Liou discloses that the system lists multiple speakers or “plurality of subtopics” (See Liou Fig. 8 and 9) within a story where the user can also move freely from one speaker to another as discussed in claim 1.

Regarding claim 4, the control device and system controller is also known as the “speaker visualization unit” and the GUI as discussed in claim 1 above is also known as a “speaker visualization page” where the GUI list various news stories or also known as “category”, represented by video images or “audio-visual segment”, from different news programs. Furthermore, the information map region defines where the news stories are located with respect to the whole news program or “a time when...at least one category of audio-visual segment is occurring during said video program”. As discussed in claim 1, the information map region allows the user to select which news story they want to view (See Ahmad Fig. 2A and 2B; column 16 lines 3-55). Furthermore, Liou discloses that the system identifies individual speakers within a story or “a person who is speaking” (See Liou column 6 lines 40-55) and displays within a tree the times when each speaker is speaking or “a person whose face is displayed” (See Liou Fig. 8 and 9).

The video corresponding to a speaker is displayed based on the selection of the user made within the tree, where the user can also move freely from one speaker to another as discussed in claim 1 (See Liou Fig. 8 and 9; column 7 lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 6, the control device and system controller executes this process, where inherently it is capable of executing computer instructions within a memory coupled thereto.

Claim 7 contains the limitations of claims 1 and 4 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims. Furthermore, Liou discloses that the system identifies individual speakers within a story (See Liou column 6 lines 40-55) and displays within a tree the times when each speaker is speaking or "plurality of time segments that show when each speaker...is speaking" (See Liou Fig. 8 and 9). The video corresponding to a speaker is displayed based on the selection of the user made within the tree (See Liou Fig. 8 and 9; column 7 lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 8, the control device and system controller acquires or "records" news programs, which the process is controlled by the user or "selected by said viewer" (See Fig. 1 and column 10 lines 40-50). Furthermore, the control device and system controller acquires secondary information or "locating additional information" that is related to the news programs and news stories and presents the secondary information to the user or "notifying the viewer of said additional information" (See Fig. 2A and 2B; column 10 lines 10-20 and column 18 line 50 – column 19 line 15).

Claim 9 contains the limitations of claim 1 (wherein the control device and system controller are embodied along with a television, a computer display monitor, or "video display system") and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim.

Claim 11 contains the limitations of claims 3 and 9 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 12 contains the limitations of claims 1 and 4 (wherein the control device and system controller are embodied along with a television, a computer display monitor, or "video display system") and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 14 contains the limitations of claims 6 and 12 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 15 contains the limitations of claims 7 and 12 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 16 contains the limitations of claims 8 and 9 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 17 contains the limitations of claim 1 (wherein the system performs the method) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim.

Claim 19 contains the limitations of claims 3 and 17 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 20 contains the limitations of claim 1 and 4 (wherein the system performs the method) and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 22 contains the limitations of claims 6 and 20 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 23 contains the limitations of claims 7 and 20 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 24 contains the limitations of claims 8 and 17 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 25 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Furthermore, Ahmad discloses that the process can be executed via instructions within a computer readable medium encoded with one or more computer programs (See column 5 lines 5-10).

Claim 27 contains the limitations of claims 3 and 25 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 28 contains the limitations of claim 1 and 4 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims. Furthermore, Ahmad discloses that the process can be executed via instructions within a computer readable medium encoded with one or more computer programs (See column 5 lines 5-10).

Claim 30 contains the limitations of claims 6 and 28 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 31 contains the limitations of claims 7 and 28 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 32 contains the limitations of claims 8 and 25 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.



Claim 33 contains the limitations of claim 20 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Furthermore, the GUI displays the news programs and the different news stories associated with the news programs in a row format or "two types of information in a two dimensional format" (See Ahmad Fig. 2B element 212).

Claim 34 contains the limitations of claim 20 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Furthermore, the GUI displays the news programs, the different news stories associated with the news programs, and the time duration of each news program and news story in a row format or "three types of information in a three dimensional format" (See Ahmad Fig. 2B element 212).

Claim 35 contains the limitations of claim 20 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to that claim. Furthermore, the GUI displays the news programs, the different news stories associated with the news programs, the time duration of each news program and news story, and each speaker associated with each news story as shown by Liou or "at least four types of information" (See Ahmad Fig. 2B element 212; Liou Fig. 8 and 9). In addition, Official Notice is taken that it is well known to display information on at least two display pages or GUIs or "speaker visualization pages". Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the control device and system controller disclosed by Ahmad in view of Liou to be able to display information on at least two display pages in order to efficiently display an extra amount information in an organized and easy to read fashion.

Regarding claim 36, the GUI also has a "display area in which the portions of the video program are displayed" (See Ahmad Fig. 2A, 203; Fig. 2B, 213; column 16 line 56 – column 17 line 8).

Claim 37 contains the limitations of claims 9 and 36 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 38 contains the limitations of claims 17 and 36 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 39 contains the limitations of claims 25 and 36 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12 July 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues with respect to claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, that Ahmad does not teach or suggest a display page that identifies at least one subtopic and at least one image associated with at least one subtopic. However, Liou discloses such limitations, which are discussed in the claim rejection above.

Furthermore, applicant argues with respect to claims 4, 12, 20, and 28, that Ahmad does not teach or suggest a display page that identifies at least one category that includes at least one person who is speaking and a person whose face is displayed. However, Liou discloses such limitations, which are discussed in the claim rejections above.

It is noted that that the previous Office Action contained Official Notice statements which have not been traversed by the applicant. Therefore, these statements have therefore been taken as admissions of prior art as dictated by MPEP § 2144.03.

Applicant is reminded that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### ***Conclusion***

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2616

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph G Ustaris whose telephone number is 703-305-0377. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5PM; Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew I Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JGU

December 13, 2004



ANDREW FAILE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600